

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/630,898	07/31/2003	Bar-Chung Hwang	Q76735	9624	
23373	7590 07/26/2006		EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			BATAILLE, PIERRE MICHE		
SUITE 800	/LVANIA AVENUE, N	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER ·		
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2186		
			DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/630,898	HWANG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Pierre-Michel Bataille	2186		

	Pierre-Michel Bataille	2186	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	· ·	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, if (a) They raise new issues that would require further continuous (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	••	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2</u> .		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
		Pierre-Michel Batai Primary Examiner	lle

Application/Control Number: 10/630,898 Page 2

Art Unit: 2186

ADVISORY ACTION

Applicant contends that the applied reference of Mick et al (US 5,751,638) fail to 1. disclose, " a global register and status values of the ports are mapped to the global register". However, referring back to the discussion of the Non-Final Rejection response (dated 06 March 2006), applicant contended that Mick et al discloses two devices to share a memory device with a semaphore logic circuit to arbitrate on a first receive basis between access requests from the left and right electronic devices, which is different from applicant's claimed invention. This constitutes admission that the global register switching one of the ports to connect with the CPU is met. The arbitration system device selectively switches or couples memory banks to the left or to the right. A global register to store status values of the corresponding ports is met as status registers 309 and 310 store values of the corresponding ports. Mick clearly teaches a status register having at least one bit indicative of a written status of at least one mailbox register associated with the first port and the second port and readable to the first port and the second port. Fig. 4 of Mick's disclosure features the access requesting device being granted memory bank access of the memory device and selectively coupling circuitry selectively coupling individual ones of memory to the left and right ports.

Mick's FIG. 3 illustrates a block diagram of a portion of the memory device 201 including memory banks and port coupling logic combined as block 301, and a semaphore logic circuit 302 providing control signals in the form of left and right-side

Art Unit: 2186

bank access grant signals, left and right ports, 203 and 204, for communicating with the left and right resource sharing devices, global register or semaphore logic having left and right status registers corresponding to the left and right memory ports.

Mick et al discloses (as depicted in Fig. 34) the left status registers 309 to include, as examples, a left interrupt status register addressable by address xx1F hex when the control signal line SEM#L is active LOW and a left semaphore status register addressable by address xx1E hex when the control signal line SEM#L is active LOW. Similarly, the right status registers 310 include, as examples, a right interrupt status register addressable by address xx1F hex when the control signal line SEM#R is active LOW and a right semaphore status register addressable by address xx1E hex when the control signal line SEM#R is active LOW. In other words both right and left status registers have the same address, corresponding to the arguments of applicant's claimed feature.

The arbitration feature, as clearly indicated by the application is the actual proof of sharing of more than one port as "a port coupling circuitry selectively couples selected memory banks to the <u>left and right</u> ports in response to the bank access grant signals. Similar to the claimed invention, Mick discloses left and right memory bank address circuits having left and right status registers storing value of the right and left memory banks and in responding to access a port coupling circuitry selectively couples selected memory banks to the left and right ports in response to the bank access grant signals.

Art Unit: 2186

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Michel Bataille whose telephone number is (571) 272-4178. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00A to 4:30P).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew M. Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Pierre-Michel Bataille **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 2186

> > 7/19/05

July 19, 2006